

**WAUKESHA COUNTY
MINUTES OF THE PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
ADMINISTRATION CENTER, ROOM AC 255/259
THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 2012, 1:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Gary Goodchild, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Commission

Members Present:	Gary Goodchild	Bob Peregrine	Pat Haukohl	
	Walter Kolb	Jim Siepmann	Bill Mitchell	Fritz Ruf

Commission

Members Absent: None

Staff

Members Present: Jason Fruth, Planning and Zoning Manager
Sandy Scherer, Senior Planner
Duane Grimm, Park System Manager
David Burch, Enterprise Operations Manager
Jason Wilke, Senior Landscape Architect
Elfriede Sprague, Clerk Typist III

Guests Present:	Bob Buchta (Oliver Construction)	CZ-1373A and CU-1274C
	Atty. Bill Chapman	CZ-1373A and CU-1274C
	William Brooks	CZ-1373A and CU-1274C
	George Krueger	SCU-1555 and SCU-1555A
	Mark Poje	SCU-1555 and SCU-1555A
	Thomas and Marjorie Rice	CS-1130
	Atty. Mike Mnichowicz	CS-1130

CORRESPONDENCE: None.

MEETING APPROVAL: None.

MINUTES Approval of the December 8, 2011, Minutes

- *Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and carried unanimously for approval of the December 8, 2011, Minutes.*

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Goodchild asked if anyone from the audience wished to address the Commission?

Mr. Grimm, Park Systems Manager, introduced Mr. David Burch, the new Enterprise Operations manager and commented that Mr. Burch had worked for Waukesha County for about 20 years before leaving for other opportunities. The Commission welcomed him back.

With no further public comment, Mr. Goodchild moved to the next item on the agenda.

• **CZ-1573A (Proven Power, Inc.) Town of Vernon, Section 1 (Conditional B-2 Local Business and B-3 General Business Districts to the B-3 General Business District)**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property, at S65W22065 National Avenue in the Town of Vernon on the aerial photograph on the southwest corner of C.T.H. “ES and Crowbar Road containing approximately 10.4 acres.

Mr. Fruth explained the property was previously occupied by Superior Landscape & Supply Inc., a landscaping business which included retail sales of all landscape materials and salt, equipment rental, and landscaping and trucking services. The property also contains a Conditional Use Permit for a poly-structure that was used for salt and material storage, which will be addressed in the subsequent conditional use amendment request (CU-1274C). He further explained that the entire property has a split zoning with the portion of the property that contains the two residences zoned conditional B-2 and the remainder of the property zoned conditional B-3. This split zoning was intended to allow the existing residences to remain, as residences are allowed in the B-2 district, but not in the B-3 district. However, the remainder of the property was zoned conditional B-3, to allow a Contractor’s Yard Conditional Use Permit, as Contractor Yards are not allowed in the B-2 district. The rezoning is required because the current conditional B-3 zoning is specific to the Superior Landscape & Supply Inc. use and therefore, no other use can operate on the property without a change to the current zoning.

Mr. Fruth continued that Superior Landscape Supply is no longer in business and the property is now bank owned. The bank has a buyer who is interested in utilizing the site for a John Deere and Kawasaki dealership, known as “Proven Power” which will sell, rent, service and repair power equipment, implements and accessories. To accommodate the dealership, the petitioner is proposing to eliminate the mixed conditional zoning on this property and consolidate under one zoning district, the B-3 General Business District. If sometime in the future, the property were again to change hands, no further rezoning would be required for those uses specified as permitted under the B-3 district. The Development Plan for both the Town and County designate this site for commercial purposes.

He explained the petitioner’s proposal is to remove all of the structures from the property (including the two residences) except for the barn building and the poly-structure. A 193 sq. ft. addition is proposed for the north side of the barn building for an entryway and the building will be remodeled to be used for offices, a training/conference room, retail showroom, and service, staging and maintenance of equipment. A loading dock is proposed on the east side of the building. The site will have additional parking areas, signage, screened outside storage, and 60,000 sq. ft. of outside display. The large poly-structure would be used for equipment that is in need of repair. He presented the Overall Site Plan (Exhibit B) and outlined the proposed changes. Mr. Fruth stated the petitioner has already received approval from the Board of Adjustment for variances from the setback requirements of the Ordinance relative to the display areas. A Site Plan and Plan of Operation will be required of Proven Power. The site currently contains storm water management facilities, which will be maintained and will also be monitored during the Plan of Operation review. The proposed use will reduce the amount of impervious surface on the site, thereby increasing the amount of green space on the site from 52% of the site to 69.6%. The most significant condition that Staff is recommending, which is consistent with the Town’s recommendation, is that the two residences be removed by June 16, 2012, unless mutually extended by the Town and County.

Mrs. Haukohl asked if there is an allowable amount of impervious surface restriction in the B-3 District? Mr. Fruth replied “No” however if there is one-half acre or more of impervious surface, stormwater review is required.

Mr. Kolb asked if the houses are currently occupied and if the petitioner wants them removed or is it a County requirement? Mr. Fruth replied the homes are vacant and that the request for their removal was proposed by the petitioner. If they remained they would have been in conflict with the B-3 District.

Mr. Brooks, from Proven Power introduced himself. He explained he operates a John Deere dealership in Burlington and John Deere has expressed they no longer have an interest in maintaining that dealership. They are looking for four lane road exposure and when traveling the state you will notice their dealerships do now have that. This site became available and they are looking to operate there as a John Deere agricultural and consumer products dealership. John Deere has a specific look they want for their dealerships and they are looking to beautify this site.

Chairman Goodchild asked the petitioner if he had reviewed the conditions and did he have any concerns. Mr. Brooks replied he had read them and they were similar to the Town's. He did not have any objections to them.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb, and carried unanimously for approval as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **CU-1274C (Proven Power, Inc.) Town of Vernon, Section 1**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property, at S65W22065 National Avenue in the Town of Vernon on the aerial photograph and indicated the request is to amend the existing Conditional Use Permit to allow the existing poly-structure to be used with the proposed Proven Power, Inc. operation.

Mr. Fruth explained the property was previously occupied by Superior Landscape & Supply Inc. and the existing poly-structure was used for salt and material storage by them. A Conditional Use Permit was obtained for the construction of the poly-structure. The permit specified that the use of the structure was to be for salt and material storage. The previous owner was granted variances by the Waukesha County Board of Adjustment to allow the poly-structure to be located 40 ft. from Crowbar Road and to be 48 ft. in height.

Mr. Fruth stated that the current request is to transfer the Conditional Use Permit for the existing poly-structure to Proven Power. Proven Power will sell, rent, service and repair power equipment, implements and accessories. This underlying use is permitted by right in the B-3 District and does not require a Conditional Use Permit. However, the petitioner is proposing to amend the existing Conditional Use Permit for the poly-structure to remain on the property and be used for cold storage of new, pre-owned, and in-need of repair equipment and machinery rather than for salt and material storage as was previously permitted. No service of equipment or machinery will be conducted within the poly-structure. It is conditioned that the poly-structure must be maintained and any repair must be made within 30 days. The Board of Adjustment approval had the condition that the building must be screened and Staff has spoken with the petitioner regarding this. Mr. Mitchell asked if the structure was currently in good repair. Mr. Fruth replied it was, as "it's only three years old".

After discussion, Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mr. Ruf for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation".

Mrs. Haukohl asked what would happen to the poly-structure if the Conditional Use was abandoned. Would the structure be required to be removed? Mr. Fruth replied the County is not requiring removal of the poly-structure as it may have value to the next owner. She noted the Staff Recommendation was written with the assumption that the accompanying rezone would be passed, however it is not noted in the conditions that this Conditional Use request is only effective upon it passing the County Board. Mr. Fruth felt it would be appropriate to add the condition to the approval.

After further discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved to approve the “Staff Report and Recommendation” as conditioned, with the following added condition:

- *This Conditional Use shall not be in effect until such time as rezone CZ-1573A for Proven Power is approved by the Waukesha County Board and the approving Ordinance is enrolled.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Mitchell and passed unanimously. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **SCU-1555 (Mark and Tracy Poje) Town of Mukwonago, Sections 28 and 33**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property at W310 S10305 Hwy. “T” in the Town of Mukwonago on the aerial photograph and indicated the request is for after-the-fact conditional use approval for commercial truck parking.

Mr. Fruth identified the property on the GIS and pointed out that it fronts part of the Mukwonago River on the west side and C.T.H. “T” on the east side. He then identified the proposed truck parking area in the front of the home and stated it does not meet the required minimum setback line from the right of way and the property lines. He continued that the petitioner’s truck is 1987 GMC Top Kick 24 foot long flat bed truck, which he uses for an off-site recycling business. The petitioner has indicated he does occasionally bring the truck home loaded. At the public hearing, a neighbor to the north, who shares a driveway with the Pojes, objected to the request on the grounds that they did not want to have to see the truck everyday and claimed that there has been more than one commercial vehicle stored on the site.

The Town recommended denial for four reasons:

1. The subject property is a nonconforming lot and it does not meet the minimum lot area requirements.
2. The proposed location for the truck parking (i.e. in front of the house) does not comply with the setback standards in the Town’s zoning code.
3. There would likely be negative effects on the water quality of the Mukwonago River if the area behind the house, which meets the setback standards, is used given the amount of impervious surface of the parking area and access to the parking area.
4. The proposed use is not consistent with the surrounding properties, which are predominantly residential.

The County does concur with the Town for denial and feels the best alternative might be to park it inside, however the petitioner has indicated the addition he is proposing will not be large enough to accommodate the truck.

Mr. Poje stated he knows he can no longer park the truck in the front of his house; however he is questioning whether he could park it on his property for an hour or so when he comes home for lunch and other short time periods. Mrs. Haukohl commented the Conditional Use request is for commercial truck storage and what he is proposing would not be considered storage. The Commission felt that as long as Mr. Poje did not abuse the parking privileges there should not be any problems. Mr. Fruth added that situation would probably not be a violation the County would be interested in pursuing.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mr. Peregrine, and carried unanimously for denial, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”.

• **SCU-1555A (Mark and Tracy Poje) Town of Mukwonago, Sections 28 and 33**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property at W310S10305 Hwy. “I” in the Town of Mukwonago on the aerial photograph and indicated the request is for Conditional Use approval for land altering activities associated with the proposed construction of a retaining wall located on the northwest side of the residence.

Mr. Krueger, representing the petitioners, presented a small model of the house and the proposed construction for demonstration purposes. He pointed out the locations of the walls and the addition. Mr. Fruth explained the petitioner replaced a private sewage system in 2010 which was located in the northwest corner of the residence on the top of the slope. At the same time the land altering activities were completed for the removal of the septic system, the petitioners excavated a portion of the slope to enlarge an existing exposure located on the west side of the residence and enlarge the flat yard grade on the north side of the residence. Previously, there was an approximate 5 ft. wall perpendicular to the residence to accommodate a small exposure. From that retaining wall, the grade sloped towards the north lot line. The proposed retaining wall would be constructed to protect the exposed slope that remains as a result of the land altering activities. An additional 4 ft. tall retaining wall is proposed to the west side of the residence for about a length of 15 ft. to protect the foundation and footings of the residence. The retaining wall perpendicular to the residence will be approximately 76.5 ft. long and 10 ft. tall and will be reduced in height as it extends further from the residence. The land altering activities that have already occurred and the proposed retaining wall will not impact the Primary Environmental Corridor and the wall will not be seen from adjacent properties. A Storm Water Permit will not be required for the proposed work because the area of disturbance is less than 3,000 sq. ft., however the Planning and Zoning Division Staff added a condition that an Erosion Control Plan be submitted for review and approval because of the proximity to the Mukwonago River to ensure there are not adverse effects. Because of the extreme height of the 10 ft. wall, the Town has included conditions that a safety rail or fence be constructed on the top of the wall and that a Professional Engineer certify the retaining wall is sufficient to support the slope and soils.

After discussion, Mr. Siepmann moved, seconded by Mr. Ruf, and carried unanimously for approval as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **CS-1130 (Thomas and Marjorie Rice) Town of Genesee, Section 8**

Mr. Fruth pointed out the location of the property on the northeast corner of C.T.H. "G" and Morris Road in the Town of Genesee on the aerial photograph and indicated the request is for a waiver from the requirement to include the remnant parcel on a Certified Survey Map.

Mr. Fruth explained the proposal is to create a 10.6 acre parcel in the southeastern portion of the property leaving a remaining parcel of approximately 79 acres. The Rice property is heavily wooded with severe slopes in the eastern portion, in particular the section that is to be divided. Mr. Fruth identified the 2.77 acre building envelope of the proposed building site on Exhibit B, not including the proposed driveway area. He explained the County Development Plan calls for preservation of environmental corridors in either open space uses or maximum one dwelling unit per five (5) acres. The lot complies in that it is ten (10) acres, however typical standards the County looks for in disturbance envelopes is about 3/4 of an acre, which is 32,670 sq. ft. per acre lot. So in this case a building envelope of almost three (3) acres doesn't give any assurance that the disturbance will be minimized. Per the aerial photograph, the top of the hill is at 1070' amsl and it steps down, placing the disturbance envelope starting at about 1030' amsl. The Land Division Control Ordinance does allow for placement of restrictions relative to preservation of Primary Environmental Corridors, so the Staff felt it was appropriate to reduce the building envelope to 32,670 sq. ft. The County just heard from the owner's attorney yesterday (Jan. 18, 2012) indicating a concern because the petitioners are proposing a geothermal system. Staff does not have any details on the proposal and feels perhaps that is the reason for the large envelope. Geothermal systems can create a rather large ground disturbance, especially if there is a loop system. Mr. Fruth continued he wrote an e-mail back to Atty. Don Murn, explaining the County would expect the disturbance to be contained within the 32,670 sq. ft. Mr. Fruth explained that Atty. Murn responded that he felt it would not be a problem to get the house within the area, but was not sure about the geothermal system. Mr. Fruth responded that if they wanted to propose something different, a new proposal should be ready to present to the Planning Commission at today's meeting.

Mrs. Haukohl asked why the petitioner was asking for the waiver. Mr. Fruth responded this is not an unusual request to make, as it can be very expensive to survey large parcels. Chairman Goodchild questioned the reason for the configuration? Mr. Fruth replied, he did not know, however he believes it was configured to take advantage of the hilltop. The County does not have control over the configuration of the lot, just the granting of the waiver. The Certified Survey Map will be reviewed by the Town only, as the 10 acre parcel is not in County Shoreland zoning. However, if the Planning Commission has any concerns, they have the option of not granting the waiver.

After discussion, Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mr. Ruf, for approval as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Memorandum". (After further discussion, the motion was withdrawn)

Atty. Mike Mnichowicz, representing the Rice's, explained the primary reason for the Certified Survey Map has nothing to do with not wanting to survey the entire property but is because the owners will not be able to gain financing for the construction of the home if it is built on the entire 80 acre parcel. They would like to remove the 10 acres from the parcel and then present it to a lender for conventional financing. He continued the current location of the driveway goes down a very long slope and both the Town and County were unhappy with the safety features and exit, so it has been reconfigured to be longer, first for safety and second to ease the slope on which it goes out. Lastly and most importantly, it has also been designed to minimize the disruption and disturbance on the site. Since the Rice's have owned the property, they have spent meticulous time preserving the native species, denuding the invasive species,

and building a site that is essentially preserved. However, they do have a problem with the building envelope, which is not required by the existing zoning, as it is not in the Environmental Corridor zoning district. Normally a smaller building envelope would help to eliminate a large amount of disturbance to a site, but in this instance it would not. He presented preliminary plans for the site and stated the home will be built on the hill top with an effort in removing no mature trees or native species. The Rice's have hand cleared the site to minimize any disturbance. He would like to propose there be no building envelope. By decreasing the building envelope the Rice's will be restricted on their design. They are trying to build a small minimal footprint home within the trees. They have built corridors within the building site, so that the large mature oak trees can exist near the home footprint. They have minimized the existence of a basement and the use of the geothermal is a green way to use the natural features to preserve the energy efficiency of the home. Given the Rice's dedication to conservation and preservation, the assurance is not only in the project they want to build but also in the actual owner.

Chairman Goodchild questioned if there were any future plans for the remainder of the property? Atty. Mnichowicz replied the Rice's do a number of conservation activities on the site now and they have no intention of developing the site. Mr. Herrmann, Town of Genesee Planner, asked the Rice's to prepare a site plan of their property as if they were going to develop it and they have done so. He presented the plan but reiterated the Rice's do not have plans for further development on their property. Imposing a building envelope in this situation and given the unique set of circumstances, does the opposite of what it is intended to do, it maximizes the disturbance.

Mr. Mitchell commented the Rice's may have the best of intentions, however it will not remain in their hands forever and the County needs to look to the future and set the restrictions appropriately. He felt he would not be averse to giving some flexibility to the envelope, however something more concrete is needed so the Commission knows what is involved with the project. Mrs. Haukohl commented regarding the Rice's statement that by setting the building envelope, the Commission is killing the whole project, because they can't do what they want to do; but there is no explanation as to why setting $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre envelope is squelching what they want to do. Atty. Mnichowicz replied it will force a redesign of the home; because you are saying you want the imprint of the user to be limited to be within that $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre. Now the home is designed to blend into the landscape, but if it is forced to be within the envelope it will force the trimming of a number of mature trees and may become box like. Mr. Siepmann asked how large was the footprint of the house? Mrs. Rice replied, "About 4,500 sq. ft." Chairman Goodchild asked Mr. Rice what size building envelope would facilitate the design he has? Atty. Mnichowicz commented the restriction is for a 5 acre lot and this is a ten acre lot. He noted that the Rice's would also like to have storage building. (At this point, Mr. Siepmann did a quick calculation of the open space that would be required for the house and arrived at approximately 28,000 sq. ft.) Mr. Rice replied to Chairman Goodchild that at this time the geothermal is anticipated to be wells, but until the heat calculations are completed, the number of wells and amount of area required for them is not known. He stated that more importantly this is not about cutting down trees, it's about compacting and disturbing the soils on the hillside. Mrs. Rice added they have carefully gone to the top of the hill and they have tagged every single tree that was important. They then had the architect design the house around the trees, including a courtyard area that preserves several other trees. The house has a larger footprint just because it is designed around the trees. They now need to find an open spot to install a septic system, find places to put the geothermal in that will not disturb any other designated trees, so there are a lot of unknown's at this particular time. They would also like to build an outbuilding. If they are limited to the smaller envelope, then there is a possibility they will have to start doing some clear cutting.

Chairman Goodchild commented that it appears the planning for the project is not complete. Mrs. Rice replied, "That's correct". Mr. Peregrine suggested the waiver be approved as requested and if the petitioners need more area when they firm up their plans, they can return and ask for a bigger envelope. Mr. Siepmann stated it was his understanding that the 32,670 sq. ft. allowance was per five acres, could it not be doubled? Mr. Fruth replied that is the maximum amount that can be disturbed on a parcel that has Corridor if zoned as such. Currently the site is not zoned Environmental Corridor; however the SEWRPC Environmental Corridor Inventory and draft County zoning maps designate the area as Environmental Corridor. It would be in everyone's best interests that it comply in the long term when the zoning changes. It is Staff's responsibility to ensure compliance with the County Development Plan, which calls for preservation of steep slopes and Environment Corridors. The County needs some number to get that job done here. The Land Division Ordinance also says that preservation restrictions can be applied to Environmental Corridor areas. The Staff thought $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre was a reasonable amount of disturbance and should accommodate a very generous size house, a driveway, and a septic system. In this case because the driveway is so long, it is not included in the calculations. A building envelope doesn't need to be square. If there were better plans on where the geothermal well, septic and outbuildings were going to be constructed, there could be some adjustments.

Mr. Siepmann commented he sees the Rice's are trying very hard to preserve the trees and their building has become relatively sprawling to work around, so only allowing 28,000 sq. ft. could be limiting to them when doing the geothermal and the septic system. He felt it wouldn't be unreasonable to consider a larger building envelope to allow for that. He suggested the building envelope be left at 2.77 acres but the amount of disturbance be limited to 60,000 sq. ft. to give the petitioners latitude. Mrs. Haukohl expressed concern about doubling the disturbance and excluding the driveway from the calculations, as it was a very large area. Chairman Goodchild asked Mr. Fruth if the Commission could approve the waiver and have the petitioner return if he needed more area. Mr. Fruth replied that the Staff Memorandum was written with the understanding of building a typical house with septic and well. There was no knowledge of geothermal wells until Staff was recently contacted. He would suggest the petitioner submit better plans showing the location of the geothermal wells, septic site and outbuilding and return to the Commission with an alternative plan. Mr. Mitchell thought it might be reasonable to just limit the area of disturbance and not have a building envelope.

Atty. Mnichowicz suggested the building envelope be left at 2.77 acres, and restrict the disturbance to less than 60,000 sq. ft. Several Commissioners felt just limiting the disturbance would be enough. Atty. Mnichowicz asked if that were the case, could the driveway be excluded from the calculations, as it already had been configured. Mr. Fruth replied, he felt a number could be specified rather than a formal envelope as there is a level of review that occurs at the Zoning Permit level. Also, the Town of Genesee has restrictions on steep slopes that are also Environmental Corridor, and he believes such areas are required to be in green or open space. Atty. Mnichowicz stated the Town approves of the Rice's plan and is not requiring a building envelope. As he interprets the Town Ordinance, it will impose additional restrictions over and above anything that is currently proposed. Mr. Fruth replied because there are various unresolved issues with this proposal, it might be better to table the matter for several reasons: to allow the petitioner to examine additional improvements, establish the size of the disturbance envelope they feel they can live with and to allow Staff to communicate with the Town Staff to further explore the Town Land Division Ordinance requirements.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mr. Peregrine, and carried unanimously to table the matter to allow Staff to communicate with the Town regarding the Town Land Division Ordinance and also to allow the petitioner to prepare plans for Staff review, that include any additional improvements such as the location of the septic field, geothermal field, additional outbuildings, etc.

PARK SYSTEM UPDATE:

Jason Wilke, Sr. Landscape Architect stated that coming up will be an amendment to the Park and Open Space Plan of the Waukesha County Comprehensive Development Plan. As part of that update the County updated their County Wide Bicycle Plan. The Development Plan recommended that the County refine the proposed system of off street, bicycle paths on arterial streets and highways systems as it was proposed in the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. The Bike Plan Committee was composed of Planners, Public Works, and Parks employees. The Committee also met with municipalities and draft plans were sent to them, the Dept. of Transportation, SEWRPC and the DNR for feedback. Over the last 1 ½ year's information was gathered and the map was created. The Bicycle Plan was designed to create safe accommodations for bicycle and pedestrian travel, and to encourage pedestrian travel as an alternative to vehicular travel. This map would come to be implemented during resurfacing or reconstruction projects. As local municipalities update their roads, they can now refer to this plan as a guideline on where to focus putting in bicycle accommodations. The State mandates, through Trans. 75, that any road project that the County or Municipality does in the State with State or Federal funding, requires them to look at bicycle and pedestrian facilities being added to the projects. The map also guides that directive. The County has three major trails, the Bugline, Lake Country and New Berlin Trail, which basically all run east/west. One of the goals is to connect those trails to some north/south destinations or loops. Mrs. Haukohl asked about snowmobile usage of the paved trails, specifically the Bugline. Mr. Wilke replied the County is working with those groups so that they will still accommodate snowmobiles on trails. Mr. Grimm added the snowmobilers have indicated it is not a problem to have cross country skiers or hikers using the trails.

Mr. Wilke continued that the idea behind the County Wide Bicycle Plan is to link paths together and make the connections between the different municipalities with the expectations, from SEWRPC's recommendation, that the individual municipalities would do Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans that are even more detailed within their communities. The County Plan would be the connector as there is development. He outlined several other proposals to the plan and entertained a few questions. The Commission thanked Mr. Wilke for the presentation.

Duane Grimm, Park System Manager, gave his quarterly park update, focusing on the 2011 volunteer program. He explained there were 999 individual park volunteers for a total of 3,100 hours. These volunteers are comprised of groups, individuals, community service volunteers, churches and scouts doing a wide variety of activities. This included everything from buckthorn control and garlic mustard pulls in the spring to doing some very extensive projects, like working on a side slope of Nagawaukee Park by filling in some eroded areas and putting an erosion blanket over the top. Retzer Nature Center logged 3,033 individuals volunteering for a total of 6,657 hours. This includes the Teacher Naturalists who assist with all of the programming at the Center. The County has naturalists at the park, but the teacher volunteers assist with the classes so there is more than one adult present. Natural landscape volunteers do special projects, such as seed collection and cleaning in the fall and assist at the plant sales in spring and fall and assisting with programming. These people work with all the programs that are at the park such as the Janboree, Wild Winter Night, Earth Week, fishing clinics, the Minooka Mash, Kohl's Go's Green Initiative, etc. The Kohl's Go's Green Initiative was a large group that had 152 volunteer for 456 man hours. This program focuses on activities that benefit families and children and working with Retzer fits that criteria. Because of this, they donate money to the Friends of Retzer, which helps the Parks as that

extra money is included in their budget. The Retzer Nature Center had an exciting year in that the Maintenance and Land Management Building was completed. The geothermal system was installed, the Retzer Pond project was completed, the Prairie Underground Wall was constructed and the old lab room was restored. Retzer is looking to have educational programming describing the workings of the geothermal wells in the future and has applied for a \$10,000 grant for this purpose. There is great interest in learning how these systems work.

Parks special events had 185 individuals working 725 hours, most of that was through Janboree, fishing clinics and Minooka Mash. Minooka Mash took over what used to be Spooka Minooka. Spooka became too large for the City of Waukesha, which was our partner in the event, and the park staff. After discussion with the City of Waukesha Recreation Dept., it was decided to scale the event back to where it had originally started, which was for children 10 and under to have a fun night at the park. The lower level of the barn was used for children activities, there was an educational night trail and Larry Katsch took groups out for owl prowls. The event was well received by the participants.

The Huber program ran from about the end of May until October. There were 31 inmates involved in the program totaling 2,024 hours of service to the park system. They needed to follow certain rules, such as no cell phone use or smoking while working and they had to be working with no idling. They wore vests stating "volunteer" on the back so they would not be confused with park workers. They were used for a variety of projects around the courthouse such as mowing the grass, picking up garbage, cleaning sidewalks, cigarette butt cleanup, branch and stick cleanup at the golf courses, etc. The parks received a good amount of service from the program and we are looking to possibly expand it in the future. Between Public Works and Parks, 31 inmates participated in the project, 5,025 hours were worked and of that 592 jail days were saved. Of those 31 inmates, 29 were successful and 2 were unsuccessful, meaning we were unsatisfied with the inmate and they were returned to the Huber program.

With no further business to come before the Commission, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mr. Ruf to adjourn at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Haukohl

Pat Haukohl
Secretary

PH:es

N:\PRKANDLU\Minutes - Final\Park & Planning Commission\2012 Minutes\2012 01 19 Minutes.doc